

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

PPLICATION NO).	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO	
10/709,036	•	04/08/2004	I-Chang Tsao	12468-US-PA	3035	
31561	7590	10/20/2006		EXAM	EXAMINER	
•		NTELLECTUAL PF	HEINRICH, SAMUEL M			
	FLOOR-1, NO. 100 DOSEVELT ROAD, SECTION 2		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER		
TAIPEI, 100			1725			
TAIWAN				DATE MAILED: 10/20/2000	5	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		Application No.	Applicant(s)	1
		10/709,036	TSAO ET AL.	
	Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit	
		Samuel M. Heinrich	1725	
Period fo	The MAILING DATE of this communication app or Reply	ears on the cover sheet with the	correspondence address	
WHIC - Exte after - If NC - Failu Any	ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY CHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DANSIONS of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. Operiod for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period we tree to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing ed patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION B6(a). In no event, however, may a reply be will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from cause the application to become ABANDON	ON. timely filed m the mailing date of this communication RED (35 U.S.C. § 133).	
Status				
′=	Responsive to communication(s) filed on This action is FINAL . 2b) This Since this application is in condition for allower closed in accordance with the practice under E	action is non-final. nce except for formal matters, p		is
Dispositi	ion of Claims			
5)☐ 6)⊠ 7)☐ 8)☐ Applicati 9)☐ 10)⊠	Claim(s) 1-7 is/are pending in the application. 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdraw Claim(s) is/are allowed. Claim(s) 1-7 is/are rejected. Claim(s) is/are objected to. Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or on Papers The specification is objected to by the Examiner The drawing(s) filed on 08 April 2004 is/are: a) Applicant may not request that any objection to the ore Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner The oath or declaration is objected to by	relection requirement. r. ⊠ accepted or b) objected to drawing(s) be held in abeyance. So on is required if the drawing(s) is o	ee 37 CFR 1.85(a). bjected to. See 37 CFR 1.121	(d).
	ınder 35 U.S.C. § 119			
12)⊠ a)[Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents 2. Certified copies of the priority documents 3. Copies of the certified copies of the prior application from the International Bureau See the attached detailed Office action for a list of	s have been received. s have been received in Applica ity documents have been received (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	ition No ved in this National Stage	
2) Notic 3) Inform	t(s) e of References Cited (PTO-892) e of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) nation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) r No(s)/Mail Date	4) Interview Summar Paper No(s)/Mail I 5) Notice of Informat 6) Other:	Date	

Application/Control Number: 10/709,036

Art Unit: 1725

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Claims 1-7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over USPN 6,875,950 to Naumov et al in view of US20050059265 to Im in view of USPN 6,146,813 to Girard et al and in view of USPN 6,897,118 to Poon et al. Naumov et al describe (Front Page and Figure 5) instant claimed apparatus components comprising the laser, resistance measurement element, and control system. The control system is connected to the laser, to the stage, and to the probe. Probe features are described by Naumov et al (column 17, lines 18-50) and the probe operation is as a measurement terminal. Im describe excimer laser having a dynamically adjustable energy density.

Art Unit: 1725

Girard et al describe (column 15, lines 1-14) operation of the laser combined with the holding tray and "measuring resistance during the process for process feedback." The laser disclosed by Girard et al is an excimer laser. Poon et al describe (Abstract) "selection of the proper laser annealing parameters is optimized by observation of the reduction of sheet resistance and concentration profile as measured on a test site." With respect to claim 1, automatic control of a dynamically adjustable excimer laser would have been obvious at the time applicant's invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art because the components for laser application and control are well known and because the dynamic adjustment inherently requires adjustability in order to have control. With respect to claim 2, Naumov et al describe an XY stage. With respect to claim 3, see the front page Figure of Naumov et al. With respect to claim 4, Naumov et al do not describe an excimer laser, however the assignee (GSI Lumonics Corporation) makes excimer lasers used for trimming. Note that Naumov et al implicitly describe (column 28, lines 23-27) pulse energy is adjustable. Description of an apparatus element as a module does not impart patentability thereto. Note. operation of the Naumov et al apparatus upon amorphous silicon thin film or for comparison with referential values stored in a database are not required for the rejection of apparatus features.

Claims 5 and 6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over USPN 6,875,950 to Naumov et al in view of US20050059265 to Im in view of USPN 6,146,813 to Girard et al and in view of USPN 6,897,118 to Poon as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of USPN 6,216,545 to Taylor. The use of a particular

measuring module would have been obvious at the time applicant's invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art because the probe and the use thereof for measuring and feedback of electrical characteristics is disclosed by Naumov et al and because Taylor discloses connection of "an electrical resistance measuring module such as a bridge" at an output circuit.

Claim 6 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over USPN 6,875,950 to Naumov et al in view of US20050059265 to Im in view of USPN 6,146,813 to Girard et al in view of USPN 6,897,118 to Poon in view of USPN 6,216,545 to Taylor as applied to claim 5 and further in view of USPN 6,927,569 to Worledge et al.

Worledge et al disclose the well known multipoint probe and the use thereof would have been obvious at the time applicant's invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art because the probe provides many measurements quickly.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed January 05, 2006 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Samuel M. Heinrich whose telephone number is 571-272-1175. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F.

Application/Control Number: 10/709,036 Page 5

Art Unit: 1725

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, P. Ryan can be reached on 571-272-1292. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Samuel M Heinrich Primary Examiner Art Unit 1725

Samuel M. Heimich